(1)

COMPANY SANITIZED

92 OCT 14 AH 1: 34

20



Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested Public Copy

38926¢1¢589 BEHR-92-1238¢

October 1, 1992

Document Processing Center (TS-790)
Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Attn: Section 8(e) Coordinator (CAP Agreement)

Dear Coordinator:

8ECAP-[

On behalf of the Regulatee and pursuant to Units II
B.1.b; II C and II D of the
[] CAP Agreement, [] hereby submits (in triplicate) the attached information. Submission of the information in this letter is made voluntarily under a recently published TSCA §8(e) reporting Q/A, June 1991 TSCA 8(e) Reporting Guide ("Reporting Guide") and is not to be construed as a waiver of due process rights, or as an admission of TSCA violation or that Regulatee's activities with the study compound(s) reasonably support a conclusion of substantial health or environmental risk.

The "Reporting Guide" creates new TSCA 8(e) reporting criteria which was not previously announced by EPA in its 1978 Statement of Interpretation and Enforcement Policy, 43 Fed Reg 11110 (March 16, 1978). The "Reporting Guide" states criteria which expands upon and conflicts with the 1978 Statement of Interpretation. Absent amendment of the Statement of Interpretation, the informal issuance of the "Reporting Guide" raises significant due process issues and



clouds the appropriate reporting standard by which regulated persons can assure TSCA §8(e) compliance.

Regulatee is claiming certain bracketed "[]" information in this submission as Confidential Business Information and has provided substantiation and a redacted copy for the public file.

For Regulatee,

[

]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CAP Confidentiality Claim: Submitter ID (including internal codes as personnel), Mixture Composition, Mixture ID, Use.

1. Confidential treatment should be afforded for an initial period of ten years. At that time the submitter will review business needs and, if warranted, may request reasonable extensions to that time period. Technology represented by the mixture is not easily protecte from competitors by obtaining patents, therefore, the submitter has maintained these compositions as trade secrets.

A ten year period is requested because the current lifetime of of [] is generally ten years. However, the technology base requested.

2. No.

- 3. No. Not to our knowledge. The submitter's practice is to disclose composition identity to outside parties only under terms of a security agreement or to the government with claims of confidentiality or trade secrecy.
- 4. All documents which reveal proprietary chemicals which comprise the mixture composition are stored in locked, limited access facilities. These documents are identified as being proprietary, secret, or confidential. As a condition of employment, employees are contractually prohibited from disclosing confidential information outside the company.
- (b) No.
- (c) No.
- (d) No.
- 6. [] quality is critical to product performance and directly impacts market share. An estimated 10-20 million dollars is required to improve manufacturing processes in order to produce [] with this improvement can be eliminated by the choice []

Additionally [] are now evaluated based on environmental impact, [] uniformity and performance characteristics, and safety. All of these qualities must be "engineered in" to our of commercializing a [] can exceed \$50,000.

DEST COPY AVAILABLE

Disclosure of [] composition would impact the submitter's

- If a competitor sees several formulas containing similar materials he could be reasonably sure that these materials are competitive value.
- Disclosure of the mixture composition (chemical identity of the components) would disclose the specific [] formula or would make it easy for a competitor to produce the same or a similar of mixture with significantly less R & D investment since the choice of mixture components would be disclosed.
- A competitor could determine a time sequence in testing based on the dates of the disclosed studies, and determine what research direction the submitter is following. For example it would be possible to track progression from one major component [] to another. Although the use of not know which of these materials is considered "better"
- Knowing that toxicity testing is not cheap, a competitor can readily assume that any composition tested by the submitter has some commercial / competitive value.
- Although the toxicity test does not identify which [] the requirements in the marketplace would make it easy to determine the [] based on the [] components.
- 7. Submitter does not agree that chemical identity is "health and the following:

 (a) No.
 - (b) Yes. This information could be established based on a precise listing of the components.
 - (c) Yes. Chemical identity information, internal codes, and personnel could disclose submitter identity and would enable cour competitors to benefit from our investment in new

Submitter Identity

Because the submitter is recognized for its [] technology, competitors could search submissions selectively for [] and, with limited investment and testing required, try them on their own products.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- "PUBLIC COPY .. Submitter's participation in the CAP is now a matter of publ
- 2. The tested mixtures are generally similar in that they are
- 3. It is likely that a competitor skilled in the art of [that, even with generic descriptions of components, the] will recognize or guess mixtures end use is that of a [
- 4. Disclosure of submitter ID with generic composition ID will make it much easier for a competitor to know that the tested recognized as a leader in [] as submitter is] production.

Composition

Revealing specific [our competitors to precisely reproduce formulations which have been developed at significant expense. Our competitors may well be able to establish a composition as [] solely on the basis of the nature of its ingredients even without making an association with the <u>Use</u>

Competitors could quickly scan submissions for this application, and use this information to develop a database re. trends in [technology without incurring R&D and testing costs which have been

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chem/ CAS # See below

COMPANY SANITIZED Generic Chem: A trialkylol alkane alkyl triester with nonionic PEG ester and Peg ether emulsifiers, an anionic fatty soap, a polyalkylene glycol and a phosphite Title:

Inhalation Approximate Lethal

Concentration

Date: 6/22/82

Summary of Effects: ALC = 2.6 mg/l.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Material Tested

Study Initiated/Completed 2/12/82-3/3/82

INTALATION APPROXIMATE LETEAL CONCENTRATION (ALC)

Summary: Groups of 6 male Cri:CD® rats were exposed none-only for single 4-hour periods to serosol atmospheres containing:

AN ALC was found to be 2.6 mg/L which is considered moderately toxic.

Procedure: Male albino Crl:CD° rats were housed in pairs in 8" x 8" x 14" stainless steel wire mesh miges. Purina Certified Rodent Chow® \$4002 and water were evallable ad libitum. Mats were weighed and observed for general suitability for at least 1 week prior to test.

Groups of A tite, 7-8 weeks old and weighing 233-25A grame, were placed in perforated stainless steel restrainers and exposed non-only two single 4-hour periods to acrosol atmospheres containing Several exposures were conducted at different concentrations until an ALC was deversimed. Surviving rats were weighed and observed daily for 14 days post exposure (weekends excluded except who deemed necessary).

Generation: The liquid rest material was heated (15-30 c) in a reservoir and metered with an FMI pump through a Spraying Systems nebulizer. Preheated (50-65°C) dilution air, added at the nebulizer, aerosolized the international sweet it into the test chamber.

Analytical: Chamber atmospheric concentrations were determined by gravimetric analysis. Calibrated volumes of chamber air were drawn through preveigned Gelman glass fiber filters at 2.0 L/min. Samples were taken at 30—sinute intervals. Concentrations were determined from filter weight gain (May) per liter of chamber air sampled. Filters were weighed on a Cahn 26 Automatic Electrobalance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Results: During exposure, a fine mist was visible to the unaided eye. Exposure data follow:

Co	acestratio	a (mg/L)	Practional Mortality					
20-25	<u>\$.D.</u>	Range	*Deaths/* Exposed					
0.57	0.11	0.44-0.76	0/6					
2.6	0.80	1.9-4.1	1/6 (1 day post exposure)					
7	C.85	5.6-4.4	6/6 (1 during exposure, 2 e 1 day, 3 e 2 days).					

Clinical Observations:

During exposure - Observations could not be made because rats were exposed none-only.

Post exposure - In a dose-dependent manner, all rats exhibited moderate to severe weight loss 20-68 hours post exposure, after which surviving rats resumed a normal rate of weight gain. Lung noise was observed at 0.37 mg/L for 2 days, at 2.6 mg/L for 16 days and at 7.3 mg/L until death. Wet perineum was observed for 2-3 days in rats at all levels. Compound-stained fur and rod massal discharge were observed for 2 to 3 days at 2.6 ass 7.3 mg/L. At 7.3 mg/L, salivation, gasping, hyperactivity, and tremers were observed until death.

An Approximate Lethal Concentration for is 2.6 mg/L. Based on Haskell Laboratory Acute Toxicity Classifications, this material is moderately toxic via inhalation exposure.

Purity: 952

Con ... Mater

Syponye: M.ae

CAS Registry No.: None

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Work and Report by:

Supervised by

Study Director:

Approved by:

Date Issued: June 22, 1982

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Material Tested

Study Initiated/Completed 1/8/82 - 1/28/82

INHALATION APPROXIMATE LETRAL CONCENTRATION (ALC)

Summary:

Male rats were exposed to atmospheres containing for single, 4-hour periods. An Approximate Lethal Concentration on a dry weight basis is 0.53 mg/L which is considered highly toxic. The calculated ALC for ratch approximately 822 water) is 2.9 mg/L which is moderately toxic.

Procedure:

Hale albino Crl:CDP rats were bost of in pairs in 8" x 8" x 14" stainless steel wire mesh cages. PuringP Corullied Rodent Clov #2000 and water were evaluable ad libitum. Rats were weighted and observed for general suitability for at least 1 week prior to tost.

Groups of 6 rats, 7-8 weeks old and weighing 375 279 grant, ---exposed to atmospheres of the test mat: "A" for surgle, 4-hour periods.
E-posures were conducted at several concentrations until an ALC was
determined. Als surviving rate were weighed and observed daily for 14 says
post-exposure, weekends excluded except when deemed necessary.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Generation:

Atmospheres of vere generated by syringe driving the finish through a Spraying Systems asbulizer. The resultant aerosel was sprayed onto the heated (212-230°C) surface of an Instatheran flack. Dilution air carried the test material from the mixing flack to the chamber.

Analytical:

in-mber atmospheres were analyzed gravimetrically at 30-minute intervals by passing calibrated volumes of test atmosphere through preveighed glass fiber filters. Atmospheric concentrations were determined from dry weight gain of the filters.

Results

A slight yellow discoloration was seen in the flash and delivery tube; no visible cloud was noted in the chamber although there was condensation on the chamber wells. Results were as follows:

Coa	Fractional Horts			
Hean	Head (Dry Weight Basis)	S.D.	Range	#Deaths/#Exposed
0.39	0.07	0-03	0.02-0.11	0/6
1.1	0.19	0.07	0.14-0.24	0/6
2.9	0.33	0.26	0.21-0.79	5/6

Observations:

During Explaure: Rate exposed to 0.07 mg/L exhibited no efverse climical signs. At higher concentrations, rate exhibited rapid and labored breathing, hyperemis, piloerection and red natal discharge. At 0.13 mg/1 rat also exhibited a hopping gait.

Post-Exposure: At concentrations < 0.19 mg/L. rate showed slight to no weight loss at 24 hours followed by weight gain. At .53 mg/L all rate except 1 showed severa weight less, labored breathing, hypersmia, and dry red ocular discharge. Deaths occurred within 48 hours. The surviv'; rat showed slight weight loss for 48 hours followed by weight gain.

An Approximate Lethal Concentration for ... on a dry weight basis is 0.31 mc/L which is considered highly toxic. The calculated ALC for (with approximately 32% water) is 2.9 mg/L which is moderately toxic.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Work and Report by

Supervised by:

Study Director:

Approved Ly

Date Issued: May 26, 1987

Triage of 8(e) Submissions

Date sent to triage:	12/14/95		ŧ	NON-CAP	CAP					
Submission number: _	1238		TSCA Inventory:	Y	N	D				
Study type (circle appropriate):										
Group 1 - Dick Clements (1 copy total)										
ECO	AQUATO									
Group 2 - Ernie Falke	SBTOX	SEN	W/NEUR							
Group 3 - Elizabeth M	,									
STOX	СТОХ	EPI	RTOX	GTOX						
STOX/ONCO	CTOX/ONCO	IMMUNO	CYTO	NEUR						
Other (FATE, EXPO, M	ET, etc.):									
Notes: THIS IS THE ORIGIN	NAL 8(e) SUBM	ISSION; PLE	ASE REFILE	E AFTER TRIAGE	DATAB	ASE EN	ITRY			
entire document Notes: Contractor revie) []	For Contrac	st tab	pages], @	.11 d	165				

•
5
ž
ĭ
_
~
=
Z
-
ij
9
ã
3 DBASI
O
ž
KING
៊
₹
2
:
Ä
9
3
×
Ξ
~
K
CEC
=
\sim

									*			
45 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 5			P F C	01 02 04 01 02 04 01 02 04 01 02 04	90 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0	01 02 04 01 05 04						
INTARY ACTIONS. NO ACTION RI PORTED STUDIES PLANNED TINDEN WAY NOTTERCATION OF WORK! MADER IN HA LAREL MSDS CHANGES PROCESSALANDEING CHANGES APPAUSE DISCONTINUED PRODUCTION DISCONTINUED CONFIDENTIAL							,	PRODUCTION				
ZONJINTARY ACTIONS: HOLD NO ACTION REPORTED HOZ STUDIES PLANNE DATINING HOS NOTTERCATION OF WORK HOS PROCESSALANDEING CHA HOG APPAUSE DISCONTINUED HOG PRODUCTION DISCONTINUED HOG PRODUCTION DISCONTINUED	1.		INFORMATION TYPE:	IMMUNO (ANIMAL) IMMUNO (HUMAN) CHEMPHYS PROP	CLASTO (ANIMAL) CLASTO (HUMAN) DNA DAMREPAIR	PRODJOSEFROC MSDS OTHER		<u>a.</u> i				
1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 100			NATION AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN	IMM CHEN CHEN	S C C	MSDS MSDS OTHER		NSE NSE				
	-	\$	INFORM	<u> </u>	924	0251 0299					,	
RMATION REQUESTED: FLWP DATE: NO INFO REQUESTED (TECH) INFO REQUESTED (VOL ACTIONS) INFO REQUESTED (REPORTING RATIONALE) OSTITION: REFER TO CHEMICAL SCREENING CAP NOTICE	2/22/95	Jonfied Confied	FC	25 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	2	**************************************	2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3	TOXICOLOGICAL CONCERN:				
CH) N. ACTIOI PORTING	120 S					_	₹ 3₹	POGICAL				
INFORMATION REQUESTED: FLWP DATE: 6501 NO INFO REQUESTED (TECH) 6502 INFO REQUESTED (TECH) 6503 INFO REQUESTED (VOL ACTIONS) 6504 INFO REQUESTED (REPORTING RAT DISPOSITION: 6503 REFER TO CHEMICAL SCREENING 6503 CAP NOTICE	CSRAD DATE:	2,2		HUMAN EXPOS (PROD CONTAM) HUMAN EXPOS (ACCIDENTAL)	HUMAN EXPOS (MONITURING) BCO/AQUA TOX ENV. OCCCREL/FATE EMER INCI OF ENV CONTAM	RESPONSE REGEST DELAY PRODACOMPACHEM ID REPORTING RATIONALE CONFIDENTIAL ALLERG (HUMAN)	ALLERG (ANIMAL) METABFHARMACO (ANIMAL) METABFHARMACO (HUMAN)	TOXICO	MON	MED	HIGH	
NFORMATION REQUESTED SSOI NO INFO REQUESTED (TE SSOI NFO REQUESTED (TE SSOI INFO REQUESTED (VE SSOI INFO REQUESTED (RE SSOI INFO REQUESTED (RE SSOI INFO REQUESTED (RE SSOI INFO REGUESTED (RE SSOI INFO REFER TO CHEMICAL SSOI IN	SR	4 SAM		N EXPOS (HUMAN EXPOS (MONI BCO/AQUA TOX ENV. OCCCREL/FATE EMER INCI OF ENV CI	RESPONSE REQEST DELA PROD/COMP/CHEM ID · REPORTING RATIONALE CONFIDENTIAL ALLERG (HUMAN)	ALLERG (ANIMAL) METABPHARMACI METABPHARMACI	81 L	<i>)</i>			
INFORMATION OSO INFO RE OSO INFO RE OSO INFO RE OSO INFO RE DISPOSITION OSO INFO RE DISPOSITION OSO INFO RE OSO INFO RECEIVED OSO IN	q	dtrain 1	INFORMATION TYPE.	HUMAN	HUMA ECO/A ENV. O EMER	RESPO PRODA REPOR CONFI	ALLER META META	SPECIES	Ž.			
5	10/14/92	nonicoic PEG ester and PEG ester emul stiers,	INFOR	0216 0217 0218	9219 9220 9221 92221	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	8220 8230 8230	VIEW	EFER)	JE)		
4	<u> </u>	PEC A	J	3 3 3	3 3 3 3	33334	222	ONGOING REVIEW	YES (DROP/REFER)	NO (CONTINUE)	K	
(2) (2) (3)	OTS DATE:	alk,	FEG	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	ONO	YES	<u>Q</u>	REFFR	
CECATS DATA: Submission # 8EHQ- 1092 -12380 (SREO. A TYPE INT. SUPP FLWP SUBMITTER NAME. CONFICURATION	δ	Kane	*		. 3 3	<u> </u>	(AL) NIMAL) L)	NTORY			\wedge	
1- CP	CB 10	PEG.		ONCO (HUMAN) ONCO (ANIMAL) CELL TRANS (IN VITRO)	MUTA (IN VITRO) MUTA (IN VIVO) REPRO/TERATO (HUMAN)	NEURO (HUMAN) NEURO (ANIMAL) ACUTE TOX. (HUMAN) CHR. TOX. (HUMAN)	SUB ACUTE TOX (ANIMAL) SUB CHRONIC TOX (ANIMAL) CHRONIC TOX (ANIMAL)	NON-CBI INVENTORY			NAME C	
AME (10 01	Kyle Jic	انتاح	ONCO (HUMAN) ONCO (ANIMAL) CELL TRANS (IN	MUTA (IN VITRO) MUTA (IN VIVO) REPRO/IERATO (NEURO (HUMAN) NEURO (ANIMAL) ACUTE TOX. (HUMAN) CHR. TOX. (HUMAN)	ACUTE 1 CHRONI CONIC TO		YES	ON ON	3	
CECATS DATA: Submission # 8EHQ. [C	SUB. DATE: \C	Frielkyl Depical	A Chose	ONC	MUT REP	^ ^		TRIAGREDATA		CAS SR	राज्यहरू)	
CECA Submit TYPE SUBM	SUB.	a č		0200	500 000 000 000 000	3 8 8 8 8 E		Ä		ບັ		

L

Acute inhalation toxicity in rats is of low concern. In one study, single 4-hour inhalation exposures to male Crl:CD rats (6/group) at levels of 570, 2600, and 7300 mg/m³ were lethal (0/6, 1/6, and 6/6, respectively). Clinical signs included salivation, gasping, hyperactivity, and tremors at the high concentration and lung noise at all concentrations. In another study, single 4-hour inhalation exposures to male Crl:CD rats (6/group) at levels of 390, 1100, and 2900 mg/m³ were lethal (0/6, 0/6, and 5/6, respectively). Clinical signs included rapid and labored breathing, hyperemia, piloerection, and abnormal gait in high-concentration animals.